



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/071,526 | 02/08/2002 | Jonathan A. Forbes | 3382-61916 | 3382-61916 2616 | |
| 26119 7 | 10/12/2005 | • | EXAMINER | | |
| KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP | | | RAMPURIA, SATISH | | |
| 121 S.W. SAL | MON STREET | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| PORTLAND, OR 97204 | | | 2191 | | |

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

7 · 3

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/071,526 | FORBES ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Satish S. Rampuria | 2191 | | |

| | Oatisii G. Kampuna | 2191 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION | FOR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in iance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep | ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C | ence, which CFR 41.31; or |
| a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing d | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that | | | r iş later. In no |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI | • | OWT NIHTIW O |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on | | | |
| been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | tutory period for reply originally set in the | final Office action; or (2) | as set forth in (b) |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | e filed within two mon | ths of the date |
| of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expressions a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS | xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) |), to avoid dismissal o | of the appeal. |
| | but prior to the data of filing a brid | f will not be entered t | 20001100 |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co | | | pecause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | w); | • | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ., , | | the issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | | ejected claims. | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | • • • | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | vill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) anowed Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15, 17, 20 and 22-32</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16 and 21 by the | Applicants. | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | - | | • |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | , | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s) | |
| 13. Other: | | | |
| | | WIL KHATRI | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) MARY EXAMINER

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

4

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claims 1, 12, 13, 17, 24, 27 and 28 require further consideration and/or search with regards to the limitation "automatically acquiring dependencies". In response to Applicants argument that the new features are recited in all independent claims, however, all independent claims do not recite the amended limitations. For example, claims 27 and 28 does not recite the limitation "after acquiring the software associated with the software dependency, updating a database at the computer indicating the software associated with the software dependency comprises recursively processing the one or more other software dependencies" as recited in such a manner in the independent claim 1. Further, Applicants description on pg. 4, lines 11-16 (as indicated by the Applicants) does not support for the limitation automatically acquiring dependencies.